

Dear FCC Representative,  
I'll make this short. As I read, this all happened before with respect to the advent of television and FM radio. In both situations, the opposition failed and technology progressed. I live in Los Angeles and while the weather is not that much of an issue (at least most of the year), traffic is. I have a long commute to school and to work and in both cases it is important to know what is going on, fast. Although I used to tune in to local news stations, there have been countless times that I have missed the reports just barely, or more importantly, the station has yet to report an issue on my route when I could have easily avoided it.

I'm not saying that the XM reports would be a panacea. However, it is helpful to have the reports on a lot faster basis and not be broken up by banter, commercials or today's news. I also think that the main reason those against this service really don't have a leg to stand on is because XM is by subscription only. If XM was directly encroaching on broadcast stations then there might be some issues as to unfair competition. Since I pay a monthly fee I think I would be entitled to something more than the ordinary traffic reports on the radio. It is no different than ordering cable and getting to see movies uncut and unedited as opposed to watching them on broadcast television which is subject to you, the FCC, and, of course, commercial sponsors. This plan to prevent XM from competing in a situation where customers would have to subscribe is unwarranted.

Please do what you can to reject the NAB's petition 04-160. It is just another case of technology progressing and since this is really not a case of unfair competition, I don't believe their wishes should be granted by passing this legislation.

Thank you.  
Respectfully,  
Scott Grumman